

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/234,485

Applicant(s)

OTSUKA ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph R. Pokrzywa

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa.

(3) Richard Kim.

(2) Madeleine Nguyen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 November 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 18, 14, 19 & 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: KULAKOWSKI (WIPO WO 97/10668)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa 11/8/02
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed proposed amendment of claims 1 & 18. The examiner agrees with applicant in that the amendment would overcome the rejection of claims 1 & 18.

However claims 14, 19 & 20 need to be more clearly defined.